



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,994	05/31/2005	Abdellatif Benjelloun Touimi	0600-1180	1649
<div>465 7590 11/18/2008</div> <div>YOUNG & THOMPSON 209 Madison Street Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314</div>				
EXAMINER				
OKEKE, EZUNNA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2432				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/536,994

Applicant(s)

BENJELLOUN TOUIMI ET AL.

Examiner

IZUNNA OKEKE

Art Unit

2432

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/31/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05/31/2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/31/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 11-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ta et al. (US-7359884).

a. *Referring to amended claim 11:*

Regarding claim 11, Ta teaches a system for accessing, at a consultation station, information associated with rights to use said information, the use rights being expressed in a particular rights expression language, the consultation station including use rights recovery means adapted to recognize use rights expressed in one or more different languages in order to access said information, which system includes a use rights adaptation unit including means for receiving use rights data associated with the information to be accessed (Col 6, Line 16-63 and Fig 1. teaches a DRM system 100 for accessing usage rights information at a client computer and according to Fig 2. interpretation process 200 can be implemented on the computer having different processes for recognizing use rights and receiving use rights data); and means for analyzing said use rights data to determine said particular rights expression language in which said use rights associated with said information are expressed, the user rights adaptation

unit being associated with means for determining the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station, and further including means for comparing the said particular rights expression language with the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station to determine if said particular right expression language is recognized by said recovery means (Col 6, Line 38-67 and Col 7, Line 1-13 and Fig. 2 teaches the processes {Localizer process, interpretation process and the simplifier process} as the means for analyzing the use rights data and according to received format and the device information, the process determines if a conversion is needed from one format to the other {See Col 6, Line 58-63}); and use rights conversion means for converting the use rights associated with said information when expressed in a language that is not recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station from said particular language in which the use rights associated with the information are expressed to another language selected from the one or more languages recognized by said recovery means of the consultation station (See Col 7, Line 14-53 teaches {Localizer process, interpretation process and the simplifier process} as the conversion means of process 200 converting the use rights format that is not recognized by the device to use rights format or language recognized by the device).

a. Referring to amended claim 12:

Regarding claim 12, Ta teaches a system according to claim 11, wherein the use rights adaptation unit includes said means for determining the one or more rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station and wherein said means for determining the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means

comprises mean for remotely interrogating the recovery means (Col 7, Line 29-40 teaches processes 200 for receiving use rights format, determining the language of the format and recognizing the rights expression language understood by the device before the conversion is done from one language to the other).

a. Referring to claim 13:

Regarding claim 13, Ta teaches a system according to claim 11, wherein said means for determining the one or more rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station include means for declaring to said adaptation unit the one or more languages recognized by said recovery means (Col 6, Line 38-67 and Col 7, Line 1-13 teaches processes 200 determining the rights expression language recognized by the device and converting the language to the right format).

a. Referring to claim 14:

Regarding claim 14, Ta teaches a system according to claim 11, wherein said information and said associated use rights are stored in the same information server connected to said consultation station and to said adaptation unit via an information transfer network (See Fig 1. Computer 130, Rights Offer 132, Network 170 and Client Environment 120).

a. Referring to claim 15:

Regarding claim 15, Ta teaches a system according to claim 11, wherein said information is stored on an information server and said use rights associated with the information are stored on a rights management server, said information server, said rights management server, said consultation station and said adaptation unit being interconnected via an information transfer network, and said information including information as to the location of said rights management

server to enable said consultation station to interrogate said rights management server in order to receive the rights associated with said information (See Fig 1, Computer 130 {Server}, Protected content 134 {information}, Rights offer 132 {use rights}, Client environment 120 {consultation station}, Client component 122 {processes, adaptation unit}, Network 170 {Transfer Network} and Col 5, Line, line 35-57 teaches the information including transaction fees and where to download licenses and usage rights).

a. Referring to claim 16:

Regarding claim 16, Ta teaches a system according to claim 14, including a plurality of consultation stations connected to said information server through said information transfer network via a plurality of network nodes and a plurality of adaptation units integrated into each of the nodes connected directly to said consultation station (Col 30, Line 31-54 teaches a plurality of computer, content servers and networks).

a. Referring to claim 17:

Regarding claim 17, Ta teaches a system according to claim 11, wherein said consultation station is connected to said adaptation unit via a mobile telecommunication network and an information transfer network and said networks are connected by a gateway including information conversion means adapted to convert the information between said mobile telecommunication network and said information transfer network (Col 30, Line 47-54).

a. Referring to claim 18:

Regarding claim 18, Ta teaches a system according to claim 11, wherein said consultation station is mobile and said recovery means are adapted to recognize the DRMREL rights expression language (Col 30, Line 31-39 and Col 6, Line 38-53 teaches the computer or

consultation station can be mobile such as a laptop and the processes are adapted to recognize a DRM Rights Expression Language such as XML or XrML).

a. Referring to amended claim 20:

Regarding claim 20, Ta teaches a method of accessing, at a consultation, information associated with rights to use that information, the use rights being expressed in a particular rights expression language, the consultation station including use rights recovery means adapted to recognize use rights expressed in one or more different languages in order to access said information, which method includes a use rights adaptation unit performing the steps of (See the rejection in claim 11):

receiving use rights data associated with the information to be accessed, analyzing said use rights data to determine the expression language of said rights, determining the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station(See the rejection in claim 11);

comparing the said particular rights expression language with the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station to determine if said particular right expression language is recognized by said recovery means(See the rejection in claim 11); and

if said particular right expression language expression is not recognized by said recovery means converting said use rights associated with said information into another language selected from the one or more languages recognized by said recovery means; and sending said converted rights to said consultation station(See the rejection in claim 11).

4. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cho (KR-2002019806).

a. Referring to newly added claim 21:

Regarding claim 21, Cho teaches a consultation station adapted to consult information associated with rights to use said information, the use rights being expressed in a particular language, including use rights recovery means adapted to recognize use rights expressed in one or more different languages in order to access said information, which consultation station includes means for declaring a list of one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means, to a use rights adaptation unit in order to receive from the said rights adaptation unit converted use rights associated with said information, the conversion being done according to one of the rights expression language of the transmitted list (See Cho, Page 7-10 teaches the client platforms as the consultation station and on Page 8, the client determines if the DRM architecture applied to the contents is supported or if the REL is recognized, if not, the client requests a conversion service through the server which converts the REL to a recognized Rights Expression Language).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ta et al. (US-7359884), and further in view of Bormans et al. (NPL, http://www.chiariglione.org/mpeg/standards/mpeg-21/mpeg-21.htm#_Toc23297977)

Referring to claim 19:

Regarding claim 19, Ta teaches a system according to claim 11 which uses DRM architecture.

Ta does not teach the DRM language as MPEG-21 rights expression language.

However, Bormans teaches MPEG-21 rights expression language (See Bormans, Section 5.5 teaches MPEG-21 rights expression language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to include the MPEG-21 Rights Expression language as disclosed by Bormans in the list of RELs implemented by Ta for the purpose of expanding the capability of the DRM system to support video contents by using the MPEG-21 REL to define usage rights for media contents such as video.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to IZUNNA OKEKE whose telephone number is (571)270-3854. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/I. O./

Examiner, Art Unit 2432

/Gilberto Barron Jr/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432